Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/552,215	LAM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James O. Hansen	3637
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>In condition for allowance</u>		
(1) <u>James O. Hansen</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr. John Janick</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 12 March 2009	Time: <u>~</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: n/a		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
/James O. Hansen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637  (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In an effort to expedite the prosecution of the application process [compact prosecution], the examiner contacted applicant and proposed minor amendments to the claims [basically, clarifying the wording concerning the interaction of the serrations with regards to the guide and support bracket] in order to clearly place the application in condition for allowance. Figure 1A was also amended in order to include a reference number on the drawing. Applicant agreed to the proposed changes as outlined in the attached examiner's amendment. It is further noted that claim 6 was amended in order to clarify an aspect of the force supplying means i.e., from producing a resilient force to locking the guide onto the support bracket, in keeping with the language as recited in claim 2 upon which claim 6 depends.